



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to send a plate with an apple to the surface of the water as a message of good fortune.¹⁰³ The apple is also the symbol of love and marriage.¹⁰⁴ The three apples in the fourth stanza are, therefore, the expression of the *Nickelmann's* love and the signal to come down to him. The white apple makes Rautendelein grow pale; the golden apple gives her riches, such riches as she spurned when the *Nickelmann* offered them at the end of Act I; the red apple signifies her death: to live with the *Nickelmann* after living with Heinrich is equivalent to death. *Rosenrot*, in popular poetry, is sometimes a color symbolical of death, as in the love-song:

"Jetzt leg ich mich nieder
Auf Heu und auf Moos,
Da fallen drei Rüsselein
Mir in den Schoss.
Und diese drei Rüsselein
Sind rosenrot;
Jetzt weiss ich nicht, lebt mein Schatz,
Oder ist er tot."¹⁰⁵

It is interesting to see how the poet follows popular traditions even in little details. Rautendelein has red shoes (Act IV), and red is the color of shoes in fairy-tales. In the story of the *Machandelbaum*¹⁰⁶ the bird brings the girl red shoes. There is a popular ballad in which the bride wears "red, red shoes,"¹⁰⁷ also a nursery rhyme in which the child takes pride in her red shoes.¹⁰⁸ Rautendelein puts fire-flies in her hair as an ornament, a trait characteristic of fairies; *Frau Venus*, in Simrock's *Amelungenlied* (ii, p. 316), wears fire-flies in her locks; in fairy-tales the fire-flies serve as lanterns.¹⁰⁹

We see that Rautendelein's elfish nature is thoroughly German; the poet has used material found in German traditions.

JOHN A. WALZ.

Western Reserve University.

¹⁰³ Grimm, *D. M.*,⁴ p. 410; *D. S.*, No. 60.

¹⁰⁴ Grimm, *D. W.*, ii, 122: *K.-M.*, No. 17; Erk-Böhme, i, p. 26; *Wunderhorn*, Berlin, 1846, iii, 27; v, 319.

¹⁰⁵ Wuttke, *Sächsische Volkskunde*, Dresden 1900, p. 243. The song begins *Jetzt geh ich zum Brünnele* and is found in different versions in many parts of Germany. Cf. Erk-Böhme, Nos. 203 ff.

¹⁰⁶ Grimm, *K.-M.*, No. 47.

¹⁰⁷ *Wunderhorn*, Berlin, 1846, ii, p. 14.

¹⁰⁸ Simrock, *Das deutsche Kinderbuch*, No. 476.

¹⁰⁹ Grimm, *K.-M.* No. 186; Andersen, *Der Reisekammerad*; Shakespeare, *Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act III sc., 1.

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

A New Study of the Sonnets of Shakespeare by PARKE GODWIN. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London: The Kickerbocker Press. 1900. 8vo, 306 pp.

SHAKESPEARE'S *Sonnets* like Shakespeare's epitaph, have had a sort of hypnotic effect on the men of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; the one preventing the curious from disinterring the dust and bones of the mortal Shakespeare, the other alluring the savants to resuscitate the dead passions of the immortal poet. Nowadays it is not so much the newness of the theory respecting the *Sonnets* that attracts readers, as the intense interest awakened by the announcement of another victim to this hypnotic influence. And now the latest is Mr. Parke Godwin.

Mr. Godwin feelingly quotes Mr. Saintsbury in saying,

"no vainer fancies this side of madness ever entered the human mind, than certain expositions of the *Sonnets* of Shakespeare."

Therefore, despite this warning from one of the sanest critics of to-day, it is almost pathetic to watch Mr. Godwin searching for "a sort of guide in the interpretation of the *Sonnets* generally." Finally he finds his guide, and "either by design or accident," this "was the central sonnet of the series as a whole. Dividing 154 by 2 we get 77, which is, strange to say, the number of this sonnet. By whom the original numbering was done we do not know, but it is certainly not an extravagance to suppose that the writer himself may have purposely affixed this 77 to a sonnet which he considered in some degree explanatory."

It is to be regretted that Ignatius Donnelly could not have lived to read these lines! Before passing into this vast edifice of mystery it is worth while to linger in the introductory vestibule and note its construction. The Introduction, subdivided into two parts, seeks to give first, a brief history of the *Sonnets*, and secondly, an outline of former expositions of the *Sonnets*. It is hardly necessary or worth the reader's while to tarry long in this part of the structure. It is too brief to be truly valuable, and too carelessly constructed to edify the lover of good literary style. But a real fault, one frequently indulged in by so-called racy, popular critics, men who by trade are

journalists, and whose journalistic slipshod manner delights in a gaudy display of witty cleverness and exaggerated bombast, is to be found here, and should not pass muster without a word of censure. Inaccuracy is rampant. It is a wrathful Sansloy pricking along the plain of sonnet-land.

On the opening page of this Introduction it reads:

"A late historian of English literature tells us that at one time in the reign of Queen Elizabeth there was an outbreak of sonnet-writing, which for mass and beauty has never been paralleled. It was a form of verse which, having long held sway in Italy, passed through France into England, where it became a fashion. Introduced by Wyatt and Surrey about the year 1550, it was taken up by a great many others, and among them by Thomas Watson, whom Spenser calls 'the noblest swain that ever piped upon an oaten quill,' then by Spenser himself, the foremost poet of his age, and finally by Sir Philip Sidney, who, as scholar and soldier, enjoyed a universal popularity."

A footnote to this citation refers the reader to Saintsbury's *History of English Literature*, page 79 (which should read page 97). This careless use of Mr. Saintsbury's criticism should not be allowed. Long before 1550, Wyatt and Surrey introduced the sonnet. Most of Wyatt's love poems were probably written between 1525 and 1537. Wyatt died in 1542, and Surrey was beheaded in 1547. Further, the sonnet did not thus find its way into England through France. And further, Spenser did not precede, but followed Sidney with his sonnet-cycle. Later on another careless statement throws the reader's time-view out of perspective: "like these (sonnets) of Spenser, Sidney, Drummond, Constable, etc., which were contemporaneous." Drummond belongs to the post-Shakespearean group of poets, and his sonnets, though Elizabethan in fashion, are not contemporaneous with those of Spenser and Sidney. The proper historical place for Drummond's sonnets may best be presented in Mr. Schelling's words,

"Although the sonnet continued a popular form during the remainder of the reign of Elizabeth and that of her successor, excepting the work of William Drummond, a scholarly poet, who lived much in the past, and series like William Browne's *Celia* and *Visions*, the

writing of sonnet sequence went out of the literary fashion with the close of the former reign."

Not only does Drummond look strange shouldering his way in between Sidney and Constable, but what will readers think when Browning is praised for his sonnets that "carry their meaning on their face." To avoid any misrepresentation I quote: "like those of Bowles, Keats, Wordsworth, and Mr. and Mrs. Browning."

Beside the pathetic this brief history of the Sonnet may be said to have its humorous side too:

"I shall not discuss these various wranglings further than to say that, in my guess, which is as good as another's, Mr. Tommy Thorpe, having read a deal in the early sonnets about begetting a 'son,' and also in the later sonnets about one Mr. Will—a pun on the author's name—and desiring at the same time to be quaint and funny for himself, put the two together in order to tell us how the exclusive author ('the onlie begetter') was no other than W. H. (Will Himself), or the veritable Master William Shakespeare."

This is doubly funny if the author thinks he is the first guesser. The Germans were before him.

The next section, upon the "authenticity and correctness" of the *Sonnets*, is also open to criticism. The author makes a wrong impression when he states,

"They were in circulation privately, according to Meres, for nearly twenty years during his lifetime, and much discussed among his friends."

They were first alluded to by Meres in 1598, and they were first published in 1609. After this date one would hardly speak of them as privately circulated. And later the author says: "Within twenty years after his decease . . . they were republished." In 1640, twenty-four years after his decease, they were reprinted with eight sonnets omitted and the order of sequence wholly changed. Again he says: "they were published seven years before he died, and attracted a great deal of attention because of his growing fame as a playwright." This is hardly warranted by the facts of the case. When Benson, in 1640, issued this altered form of the *Sonnets* he prefixed an address "to the reader," which in

forms us to-day that the *Sonnets* on their first publication were "less popular than the plays." If one considered the numerous editions of Sidney's or Spenser's works within a short lapse of time, one would hardly count the thirty-one years that intervened between the first publication of these *Sonnets* and their second altered publication as evidence of popularity. It is not exact to say "they were much discussed among his friends" and "attracted a great deal of attention." This exaggerated tone is really corrected by the writer himself in another place:

"To this brief history of the *Sonnets* it is perhaps well to add that they never acquired the popularity of Shakespeare's plays, or of his other poems: for while the *Venus and Adonis* and the *Lucrece* passed rapidly through several editions, the *Sonnets* were not republished until 1640—thirty-one years after the poet's death."

Because this same Quarto

"abounds in typographical and other errors which might easily have escaped the eyes of a proof-reader, but not those of the writer himself,"

Mr. Godwin believes that Shakespeare had nothing to do with its publication. All agree with this. What are we to think of the errors of this book? Here are a few specimen lines: "in Sonnet 48 (it should read 46), *their* is put for *thy* no less than four times." Again, "in Sonnet 144, the second line repeats the close of the first line," which should read, the beginning of the second line, etc. And two pages further on it states, "the (sic) most of them, in existence in 1597, when Meres alludes to them," which should read in 1598. Again he affirms that the second edition "omitted seven of the best sonnets," instead of eight. All these are slight mistakes, they, however, detract from the value of the work, and render questionable the "eccentric interpretation in which the editor indulges" later on.

I pass now to the second chapter of the Introduction. This treats of former expositions of the *Sonnets*. The author severely censures the varied views advanced by his predecessors in this domain of Shakespearean criticism. Three modes of exposition are classified briefly, fantastic, allegorical, and amatory. This last classification of the *Sonnets* the writer regards as the "most mis-

leading and pernicious;" namely, that expressing the poet's unbounded love and admiration for a young friend. The writer is wrong in supposing that Barnfield addressed his sonnets to a lady. His young Ganymede was no poetic illusion, but a friend in the flesh, whose personal charms are celebrated in the most orthodox sonnet language. The critic in hand refuses to entertain the idea that either the Earl of Pembroke or the Earl of Southampton could be the young friend of Seakepeare.

"Had the combatants paid any attention to the requirements of chronology, they would have seen that they were both barking up the wrong tree; for if we suppose the *Sonnets* to have been written during the period I have fixed—that is, between 1582 and 1592—as Southampton was born in 1573, and Pembroke in 1580, they were neither of them of any age to attract the notice of the poet."

It all depends on the "if we suppose." "Your If is the only peace-maker; much virtue in If."

Passing from this Introduction of fifty pages to the main body of the work, which has been subdivided into two parts: Part First, "A New Study of the Sonnets," and Part Second, "The Original Sonnets as Newly Arranged," one cannot but carry the impression of gross inaccuracy and superficialness such as I have called to the reader's attention in the survey of this Introduction. In this part of the work falls the writer's most serious task. He disclaims having a theory and he must prove at the same time that the sonnets arrange themselves of themselves, at least so far as to satisfy the judgment of the reader. The divisions that formed themselves in this spontaneous way may be arranged as follows:

- I. A central or explanatory sonnet.
- II. A few sonnets that cannot be gathered into a fold with any of the others, and stand out as so many Independents: nine in all.
- III. A group forming a somewhat continuous poem, which is commonly said to be a persuasion to a young man of genius and promise to get married, but which has, as I take it, an entirely different object.
- IV. A series of Love Poems, descriptive (a) of an early and ardent attachment, (b) of a separation from the beloved, (c) of the pains

and pleasures of absence, and (d) of a young poet's first impressions, under these circumstances, of the great world.

V. Another group of Love Poems, but of another kind, depicting the origin, progress, and end of an irregular amatory relation, and which may be called "The Episode of the Dark Lady."

VI. And finally, a group relating to the poet's communion with a Higher or Tenth Muse as he calls it, meaning the personified Spirit or Genius of Poetry in its highest conception. This group reveals (a) the youthful aspirations of the poet, (b) his efforts to realize them, (c) the obstacle he encounters, and (d) his ultimate success and triumph over all difficulties.

Of these divisions the first that requires attention is No. III. Because the young friend is advised to marry, and the word "marriage" does not enforce the obligation, the writer disfavors the marital theory. I suppose all the wooings of *Love's Labor's Lost* are lost upon him for the same reason. Poetry sometimes expresses one thing in words of another. "Husband and wife," "the prospective bride and blessing of the lad" do not have to appear in black and white to convey an idea of their existence in the mind of the poet. True the language is often figurative, but the probable solution offered by Mr. Godwin renders this language absurd. He believes that the poet means the spiritual process of creation, or the exercise of his faculties in verse-writing or poetry. To secure such an interpretation resort is made to most far-fetched readings; for example, in the closing couplet of Sonnet 7, the word "son" is believed to mean "some product of his genius:"

"So thou, thyself outgoing in thy noon,
Unlook'd on diest, unless thou get a son,"

There is a great deal of beating about the bush to secure these very strange, or figurative if the word seems better, readings. Even former critics are misdealt with. In discussing Sonnet 25, Professor Dowden is only partly quoted and therefore made to appear in a false light. "His ode was not a complaint against adverse fortune, as Professor Dowden strangely remarks, but just the reverse," etc. What the Professor did say in full was this:

"In this sonnet Shakspeare makes his first complaint against Fortune, against his low condition. He is about to undertake a journey on some needful business of his own (XXVI. XXVII.), and rejoices to think that at least in one place he has a fixed abode, in his friend's heart (I. 14).

He turns his complaint into rejoicing. Professor Dowden was not far out of the way.

Certain of these sonnets the writer believes were addressed to Anne Hathaway.

"Interpreting these three sonnets as addressed by a rustic lover to his rustic sweetheart, may we not conclude from the little we know of the poet's real life, and not from guesses in the void, that if they related to any person in particular it must have been to Anne Hathaway, then or soon to become his wife?"

This is a curious process by which to arrive at a "must have been."

So one might follow the writer through all the "divisions" and finally through his rearrangement of the sonnets, finding numerous points of interest and numerous points for further criticisms. If one grant that the *Sonnets* are figurative at the outset, he will readily fall in line with this arrangement or any possible arrangements. It may be the advent of Higher Criticism into the region of the sonnet. I think the orthodox view, however, will continue to be held by those who have labored not only with the *Sonnets* of Shakespeare, but also with the sonnets of his many contemporaries.

C. F. MCCLUMPHA.

University of Minnesota.

GOTHIC LANGUAGE.

Kurze Einführung in das Studium des Gotischen von WILHELM GLIESE, Oberlehrer an der Sophienschule zu Berlin. Heidelberg: 1900.

THIS introduction to the study of Gothic is, as the preface states, an attempt to lead the student by a shorter road than usual to the goal. It is an inductive method much on the order of Zupitza's *Einführung in das Mittelhochdeutsche*; it takes up and interprets a passage selected from the gospel of Mark and in this incidental manner gradually acquaints the student with the main points of Gothic grammar. It does not claim to be exhaustive, but advises the student after finishing the